




Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07/05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) ITL.0680US (P12998)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR on <u>July 6, 2006</u>		Application Number 10/020,398 Filed December 12, 2001
Signature 	First Named Inventor Randy P. Stanley	
Typed or printed name <u>Cynthia L. Hayden</u>	Art Unit 2151	Examiner Khanh Q. Dinh
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.		
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.		
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.		
I am the		
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.		Signature <u>Timothy N. Trop</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)		Typed or printed name <u>Timothy N. Trop</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>28,994</u>		Telephone number <u>(713) 468-8880</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____		Date <u>July 6, 2006</u>
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.		

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:

Randy P. Stanley	§ Art Unit:	2151
Serial No.: 10/020,398	§ Examiner:	Khanh Q. Dinh
Filed: December 12, 2001	§ Docket:	ITL.0680US P12998
For: Local Caching of Images for On-Line Conferencing Programs	§ Assignee:	Intel Corporation
	§	

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF**  
**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Sir:

Pre-appeal review is requested because the cited references both work in the same general way and both work differently than what is claimed.

What is claimed is a situation where, in the course of an on-line meeting, the second processor-based system wants to send information, such as a slide for a power point display, to a first processor-based system. Rather than simply accept the display, the first processor-based system takes information from the second processor-based system to determine whether the first processor-based system already has the slide and, therefore, can avoid having it resent to avoid the delay associated therewith.

Thus, the situation here is that the second system is ready to send the information to the first system and the first system firsts checks to determine whether to accept that transmission or simply to obtain the information locally.

In contrast, both of the cited references use caching systems. In these caching systems, the first processor-based system decides it wants a certain document and determines before it seeks it externally whether the information is in a local cache. It never receives information from a second

Date of Deposit: July 6, 2006  
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*Cynthia L. Hayden*  
Cynthia L. Hayden


processor-based system about something that would be sent if it was not already locally cached. Thus, none of the cited references involve the situation where the second processor-based system has something that it would send and the first processor-based system decides whether or not to accept the transmission or not.

It is conceded that Delaney does not specifically disclose upon receipt of the image data using received image data to determine whether the information for the image is already stored in a local cache and determining if it can locally acquire the second information sufficient to display the image. It is suggested that Maddalozzo teaches "upon receipt of the image data utilize receipts image data to determine whether the information for the image is stored in the local cache," citing Figure 5C, column 9, lines 4-60 and column 11, line 42 to column 12, line 58. But nothing here teaches what is claimed which is received first information from the second processor-based system. In other words, the one that would send it sends the information to avoid having to send the information.

Instead, in Maddalozzo, the request for the information is internal. The information is requested by a browser application program and it is not offered up by an external second processor-based system. See column 9, line 17. In other words, the initiator of the request is always the first processor-based system, not the second processor-based system.

Therefore, neither reference teaches the situation where an external processor-based system provides information from which the first processor-based system can determine whether it needs to accept the information from the second or external processor-based system. Since this element is not taught in either reference, there is no basis for the rejection, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out, and the rejection should be reconsidered.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

Date: July 6, 2006